EMMA vs MADAME BOVARY

*by Virgil W. Topazio**

Why did Flaubert entitle his masterpiece *Madame Bovary* instead of *Emma Bovary*, when the title "madame" in the nineteenth century implied all the praiseworthy qualities of wife, mother, and respectable member of society? That it was a conscious choice is beyond question, given the care Flaubert exercised in the choice of every word, and the particular pains he took in the selection of names for his characters.[1] A close study of our heroine, we are convinced, reveals that Emma throughout the novel portrays the very antithesis of everything "Madame" connoted, and that the title deliberately serves as the capstone to the elaborate meshwork of irony that permeates the entire work. Readers and critics alike are in general agreement with Alfred Engstrom that "The more carefully one examines its separate strands, the more startlingly evident is the ironic tissue of the whole."[2]

An incurable romantic like Emma Rouault Bovary was destined to rebel, to suffer, and to be marked for tragedy. Nineteenth-century France, in which she had the misfortune to live, found her life of illusion unpardonable; for Emma a life without illusion was unbearable. Her philosophy of life was diametrically opposed to the reality around her, but like a typical Romantic, she rationalized the uniqueness of her position: "Tout ce qui l'entourait immédiatement, campagne ennuyeuse, petits bourgeois imbéciles, médiocrité de l'existence, lui semblait une exception dans le monde, un hasard particulier où elle se trouvait prise, tandis qu'au delà s'étendait à perte de vue l'immense pays des félicités et des passions."[3]

Charles Baudelaire intuitively recognized that Flaubert, in writing *Madame Bovary*, had stripped himself of his sex and become a woman, thus "infusing virile blood into the veins of his creature"; as a result "because of her energy and ambition and capacity for revery, Madame Bovary remained a man."[4] This identity of spirit with Emma obviously excluded her from his general complaint to Louise Colet that "rien dans ce livre n'est tiré de moi, jamais ma personnalité ne m'aura été plus inutile. . . . Juge

*Editor's Note: Mr. Topazio is Professor of French and Dean of Humanities and Social Science at Rice University.

donc, il faut que j'entre à toute minute dans des peaux qui me sont antipathiques."[5] To insure the death dictated by the Delamare story, and motivated to some extent by the painful catharsis to which he was subjecting himself, Flaubert, her creator-impersonator, denied Emma the necessary awareness of the inescapable rules universally accepted for community living: an individual must compromise with society, withdraw from it, or be prepared to suffer society's revenge if one rebels.

Had Emma remained single, a life of illusions might have been permissible within limits tolerable both to her and to society. Having married, in order to escape the uneventfulness of her life on the farm, she tragically limited her freedom of action, even though ironically Charles was without doubt the most suitable man in Tostes to satisfy her impractical demands and needs. After all, Charles did have the most respected position in the town, and despite all the derogatory criticism of Charles, at least by comparison with the average husband of that period, he was more sentimental, attentive, romantic, and though at times incredibly insensitive psychologically, at any rate forgiving by nature.

To attribute Emma's tragedy substantially to Charles's weaknesses, as some are wont to do, is to misread the novel and Flaubert's intentions. Erich Auerbach was only partially right when he said: "Each of them is so immersed in his own world—she in despair and vague wish-dreams, he in his stupid philistine self-complacency—that they are both entirely alone. . . . For, privately, each of them has a silly, false world, which cannot be reconciled with the reality of his situation, and so they both miss the possibilities life offers them."[6] This traditional characterization of Charles simply is not accurate, we feel, even though he fell far short of Emma's abstract ideal of perfection. What significantly contributed to the failure of their marriage was the sense of despair at the inescapability of her unvarying world. Flaubert's description of their mealtime hour, traditionally a time that unites the members of a family, confirms this: "Mais c'était surtout aux heures des repas qu'elle n'en pouvait plus . . . toute l'amertume de l'existence lui semblait servie sur son assiette, et, à la fumée du bouilli, il montait du fond de son âme comme d'autres bouffées d'affadissement" (p. 89).

It is clear that she could never have found lasting happiness with any man, not even a Léon or a Rodolphe. Léon's romantic behavior was patently a transitory pattern of youth exaggerated for and because of Emma. Rodolphe's infidelities and indifference certainly would have quickly crushed Emma's idealistic concept of love. Charles, by contrast, offered a sincere and enduring love. To quote Harry Levin: "his love is the most devoted that Emma finds—as Flaubert expressly states in his work-sheets, adding: 'This must be made very clear.'"[7] To Charles, Emma represented the epitome of everything desirable in a woman, especially after his arranged,

loveless marriage with Héloise (what a brilliant touch of irony in the name, considering the difference between the legendary and totally romantic lover by that name and the waspish, angular, unattractive, and middle-aged bourgeoise who was Charles's first wife).

With Emma, Charles was ecstatically happy. "L'univers, pour lui, n'excédait pas le tour soyeux de son jupon; et il se reprochait de ne pas l'aimer" (45). Often, after having already left to visit his patients, he would race back into the house for one more embrace: "il arrivait à pas muets, il la baisait dans le dos, elle poussait un cri. Il ne pouvait se retenir de toucher continuellement à son peigne, à ses bagues, à son fichu; quelquefois, il lui donnait sur les joues de gros baisers à pleine bouche, ou c'étaient de petits baisers à la file, tout le long de son bras nu, depuis le bout des doigts jusqu'à l'épaule" (45–46). Certainly no normal wife could have asked for a more attentive husband. Yet what was her reaction? In the very next paragraph Flaubert described Emma as disenchanted. Her life, she discovered sadly, did not resemble that of "ces châtelaines au long corsage, qui, sous le trèfle des ogives, passaient leurs jours, le coude sur la pierre et le menton dans la main, à regarder venir du fond de la campagne un cavalier à plume blanche qui galope sur un cheval noir" (49).

It became evident from the start that the worlds of Emma and of Madame Bovary could never merge. The dichotomy between the two was indirectly underscored by the incident when Rodolphe impulsively addressed her as Emma. Her instinctive reaction was to object, whereupon Rodolphe remonstrated in a melancholic voice: "Ah! vous voyez bien que j'avais raison de vouloir ne pas revenir; car ce nom, ce nom qui remplit mon âme et qui m'est échappé, vous me l'interdisez! madame Bovary. . . . Ce n'est votre nom, d'ailleurs; c'est le nom d'un autre!" (211–212). Emma's failure was that she remained Emma from beginning to end. Marriage, motherhood, and society had little if any effect on her attitudes toward life. The reaction to her mother's death accurately presaged her future behavior pattern. She enveloped herself in a self-induced pall of sorrow and melancholy, and "fut intérieurement satisfaite de se sentir arrivée du premier coup à ce rare idéal des existences pâles, où ne parviennent jamais les coeurs médiocres" (52). At no time during her grief does she give any indication of a real sense of loss or love for her mother. This was the first example of her emotional and self-centered play-acting, indulged in throughout her married life, the purpose of which was to ascend to that visionary plateau where only superior souls abide.

How and why did Emma fail to live up to the family and social responsibility which the title "Madame Bovary" entailed? To begin with, whenever Emma was confronted with conditions or situations which forcibly brought her face to face with the unpleasantness of her personal existence, she sought refuge in exaggerated reactions, either excessively conventional or

very unorthodox. What permitted her to persevere after each traumatic confrontation between illusion and reality was her misfortune of always having someone or something loom on the horizon just when everything looked hopeless and a reluctant resignation to an unhappy bourgeois life seemed imminent.

Her marriage symbolized the first escape route. Quickly disappointed, she indulged in the first of many attempts to "demander des oranges aux pommiers" (II, 130). With a vengeance she turned her attention to running an efficient home and playing at being an ideal wife. Poor Charles accepted her behavior at face value; he was deliriously happy. In a short time she realized the futility of her approach, however, so she resigned herself to long walks with her dog, Djali, after which "elle s'affaissait dans un fauteuil, et de toute la soirée ne parlait pas" (61).

Their marriage might have conceivably developed into just one more misalliance had not the ball at Vaubyessard intervened to give a touch of reality to her fictitious world. Flaubert described the effect of the ball thus: "son coeur était comme eux [her satin slippers]: au frottement de la richesse, il s'était placé dessus quelque chose qui ne s'effacerait pas" (76). Her imagination rekindled by her brush with nobility and by having seen at first hand the life and luxury only dreamed of before. She strove more determinedly than ever to fulfill the inner Emma by transforming her drab existence with touches of elegance. This second attempt to transcend Madame Bovary equally misled Charles into believing he was the most fortunate of men, but "ce n'était pas, comme il croyait, pour lui; c'était pour elle-même, par expansion d'egoïsme, agacement nerveux" (84).

Instead of occupying herself constructively and cultivating social relations with the other women of the town, she continued to nurture her dreams in isolation, and "comme les matelots en détresse, elle promenait sur la solitude de sa vie des yeux désespérés, cherchant au loin quelque voile blanc dans les brumes de l'horizon" (84–85). Perceiving no possible relief in Tostes, she neglected everything, and "ne cachait plus son mépris pour rien, ni pour personne" (90). The only solution conceivable in Emma's eyes was to leave Tostes. Her wifely duties and responsibilities never even entered her mind; the fact that Charles had a well-established practice and that he liked Tostes in no way deterred the selfishly motivated Emma. It was after they decided to leave Tostes for Yonville that Emma learned she was pregnant—a symbolic suggestion of a new life ahead.

Her first failure as a mother occurred upon receiving the news that she had given birth to a girl: "Elle tourna la tête et s'évanouit" (120). She named the child Berthe, after a young woman at Vaubyessard, but this did little to alleviate her disappointment. A boy, she fancied, could have been free to "parcourir les passions et les pays, traverser les obstacles, mordre aux bonheurs les plus lointains" (120).

At Yonville, Léon, the poetically inclined and melancholic young man, fed Emma's insatiable yearning for the illusory life of her dreams. Compared with Léon, Charles understandably appeared more and more inferior, especially since she magnified every failing of Charles. Only her equally unrealistic conception of love prevented her from submitting to Léon. "L'amour, croyait-elle, devait arriver tout à coup, avec de grands éclats et des fulgurations,—ouragan des cieux qui tombe sur la vie, la bouleverse, arrache les volontés commes des feuilles et emporte à l'abîme le coeur entier" (136).

The appearance of Lheureux, the merchant, was skillfully timed to surmount the increasing boredom she experienced from continually playing a role that contradicted her true nature. Lheureux represented temptation, as had Léon and the ball at Vaubyessard, but Emma resisted Lheureux's blandishments because she managed to derive sufficient elevation of spirit and a feeling of grandeur from her self-abnegation. Indeed, she enlarged the size of her pedestal: "on la vit prendre à coeur son ménage, retourner à l'eglise régulièrement et tenir sa servante avec plus de sévérité. Elle retira Berthe de nourrice" (144). To the role of virtuous wife, she added that of doting mother and charitable church member. "Les bourgeoises admiraient son économie, les clients sa politesse, les pauvres sa charité" (146). Though these many facades deceived the public and her husband, she herself remained "pleine de convoitises, de rage, de haine. Cette robe aux plis droits cachait un coeur bouleversé, et ces lèvres si pudiques n'en racontaient pas la tourmente" (146).

Madame Bovary and Emma were engaged in a Dr. Jekyll–Mr. Hyde struggle. Emma was convinced she was in love with Léon, yet with a fine insight into feminine psychology, Flaubert had her shun his presence "afin de pouvoir plus à l'aise se délecter en son image. La vue de sa personne troublait la volupté de cette méditation" (146). Contrary to the opinion of several critics, Emma was not a lecherous woman; sex per se did not interest her. She employed love, the only means at her disposal, to achieve the romantic happiness she felt was indispensable to life.

The role of mother is as important an association with the title madame as that of wife. Emma's neglect of Berthe was shocking, to say the least. Her lack of love was dramatically demonstrated when, after her fruitless visit with Bournisien, Emma struck the child. Even during the disingenuous solicitude she immediately showered upon the hurt child, Emma revealed her lack of affection for Berthe when she could not suppress the thought: "comme cette enfant est laide!" (157). No reference either before or after this incident was ever made to Berthe's ugliness, so the ugliness was in the eye of the mother—just the opposite reaction from what one should normally expect from a mother.

With Léon's departure for Paris, Emma again suffered from a "mélancolie

morne" and "désespoir engourdi." "Les mauvais jours de Tostes recommencèrent" (169), this time reinforced by her experience with Léon. To compensate for this void, our thwarted heroine allowed Emma to triumph over Madame Bovary by resorting to unpredictable and bizarre "fantaisies" which drove Charles to tears—a reaction, we might add, hardly attributable to an insensitive husband. Charles's mother wisely recommended "des occupations forcées, des ouvrages manuels," but alas the hapless husband, blinded by his love and concern for her health, could only remonstrate, "Pourtant elle s'occupe" (171).

The foreboding bleakness that stretched out before Emma, after Léon's departure for Paris, was broken by the announcement of the "Comices Agricoles" and the subsequent encounter with Rodolphe. The latter cleverly managed to inflame the dormant desires in Emma's breast. This time, to facilitate Emma's ruin, Flaubert confronted her with the much bolder Rodolphe, a man accustomed to female conquests. In our opinion, even after Rodolphe's seduction of Emma, masterfully described by Flaubert, what intrigued and interested Emma was the idea "de posséder enfin ces joies de l'amour, cette fièvre du bonheur dont elle avait désespéré" (221). What may strike the reader as the wanton actions of a completely sex-driven woman were Emma's desperate actions to recapture what she had naively imagined as an idealistic and romantic love. When the affection, love, and attention of each lover began to wane, "Elle n'y voulut pas croire; elle redoubla de tendresse" (232)—a perfectly understandable pattern of behavior from a psychological point of view.

After her first act of adultery: "Elle devenait elle-même comme une partie véritable de ces imaginations et réalisait la longue rêverie de sa jeunesse, en se considérant dans ce type d'amoureuse qu'elle avait tant envié. D'ailleurs, Emma éprouvait une satisfaction de vengeance. N'avait-elle pas assez souffert!" (221–222). The feeling of revenge psychologically accounts for the absence of any remorse, either as a mother or wife. The disillusionment she experienced, as Rodolphe changed from lover to sexual exploiter, caused her to reminisce about the happy days of her youth: "Quel bonheur dans ce temps-là! quelle liberté! quel espoir! quelle abondance d'illusions! Il n'en restait plus maintenant! Elle en avait dépensé à toutes les aventures de son âme, par toutes les conditions successives, dans la virginité, dans le mariage et dans l'amour;—les perdant ainsi continuellement le long de sa vie, comme un voyageur qui laisse quelque chose de sa richesse à toutes les auberges de la route" (235).

Her reaction to this discovery was predictable. She momentarily showered love and attention on Berthe and Charles. To her amazement she noticed good qualities in Charles, even to noting "avec surprise qu'il n'avait point de dents vilaines" (207). Enraptured and seduced by her own masquerade of virtue and piety, she began to wonder whether the traditional, bourgeois

route could lead to the happiness that had thus far eluded her. An excellent opportunity to implement this approach presented itself when Homais broached the possibility of operating on Hippolyte's clubfoot. Emma joined Homais and others in persuading Charles, against his better judgment, to perform the operation: "Le malheureux céda, car ce fut comme une conjuration" (239).

A wife encouraging her husband to become important and successful sounds commendable. That she, like Homais, was doing it only for selfish reasons became crystal clear once the operation proved to be a failure. No wife could have acted more uncomprehendingly, viciously, and despicably than Emma did at the most agonizing period in her husband's life. Seeing his hopes and dreams shattered, his career ruined, Charles sought her support and consolation. What was the reaction of his darling wife? "Emma, en face de lui, le regardait; elle ne partageait pas son humiliation" (251). Her blindness and egoism were such that she sincerely believed he was insensitive to what was taking place, when any child could have seen that he was physically and psychologically mortified by the experience. Instead of solace and encouragement, she heaped scorn on him. At one point, Charles pleaded for a word of comfort: "Assez! s'écria-t-elle d'un air terrible" (254). It is difficult to imagine a greater mockery of the title Madame.

Just as Flaubert was pictured by Lucien Laumet as "indigné par la platitude de la vie qui s'acharne à le désillusionner"[8] Emma rebelled at the seeming conspiracy against her epitomized by the failure of the operation. Consequently, she abandoned herself to Rodolphe with a perverse and vengeful pleasure. Her actions and appearance were now in flagrant defiance of all that society had a right to expect of a respectable wife and mother. She openly strolled with her lover, smoked cigarettes out-of-doors, and dispelled any remaining doubts about her virtue by appearing one day in "un gilet, à la façon d'un homme" (262). Characteristically, she ignored the reality of her liaison with Rodolphe; she began to dream of a life with him in some romantic setting "ombragée d'un palmier, au fond d'un golfe, au bord de la mer" (268). When this bubble was burst by Rodolphe's departure without her, the annihilation of all her hopes was more than she could bear.

At one point during the prolonged illness that followed Rodolphe's desertion, she received communion, and her response prefigured a similar scene at her death-bed. "Sa chair allégée ne pensait plus, une autre vie commençait; il lui sembla que son être, montant vers Dieu, allait s'anéantir dans cet amour comme un encens allumé qui se dissipe en vapeur . . . et ce fut en défaillant d'une joie céleste qu'elle avança les lèvres pour accepter le corps du Sauveur qui se présentait" (291). She looked to God, as she had to husband and child, to find a substitute for or escape from reality.

In Emma's behalf, religion, represented by the uncomprehending Bournisien, offered no succor at a time when her rehabilitation was still possible. The sad truth is that no one seemed capable of either understanding or assisting a person like Emma when she instinctively sought help. On the other hand, Emma was always ready to mitigate her own guilt by implicating others, and the principal victims of her incorrigible actions were Charles and Berthe.

The almost fatal illness had virtually purged Emma of her dreams and illusions, so figuratively speaking Madame Bovary really predominated for the first time. She not only undertook charitable works, she assumed the normal religious duties expected of someone in her position. More significantly, she began to interact with the other women in the town. "Emma, presque tous les jours, avait encore d'autres sociétés. C'étaient madame Langlois, madame Caron, madame Dubreuil, madame Tuvache, et, régulièrement de deux à cinq heures, l'excellente madame Homais" (294). The very litany of the repetition of the title "madame" before each name must have been specifically employed by Flaubert to underscore the meaningful shift in Emma's role.

Under normal circumstances, Emma might have gone on from that point to lead the typical life of a provincial wife and mother. But the already predetermined fate of the heroine necessitated the introduction of still another temptation to revive the illusions, temporarily submerged. This time it was a trip to Rouen, inspired by the anti-clerical Homais to spite Bournisien.

For the second time the simple and solicitous Charles ironically played the unwitting accomplice to his wife's adultery. Through Charles's incredibly naive insistence that she remain at Rouen, she became the mistress of Léon, who had moved from Paris to Rouen. The shabby affair that ensued inexorably brought about her total degradation and eventual doom. She indulged in lies, intrigue, and deceit to facilitate the weekly meetings with her lover. To these sins, she added the most heinous crime in the bourgeois catalogue, the expenditure of badly needed family funds on extravagant presents for a lover. To remain faithful to her self-image of a romantic heroine and in order to retain Léon, Emma incurred tremendous debts with Lheureux. The inevitable financial complications finally succeeded in bringing about her downfall. Ironically, this soul that had passionately striven to rise above the world of mediocrity was entrapped by the most materialistic of things—money.

Throughout her trials, as she hopelessly tried to extricate herself financially from the ever-tightening clutches of the law, she remained true to Emma. For one thing, she adamantly refused to consider the one solution that remained open to her, Charles. "Oui, murmurait-elle en grinçant des dents, il me pardonnera, lui qui n'aurait pas assez d'un million à m'offrir pour

que je l'excuse de m'avoir connue. . . . Jamais! jamais!" (415). In keeping with her romantic ideas though, it was perfectly logical to receive help from a lover. And it is interesting to note that the predominant feeling she experienced at the final refusal from Rodolphe was that of a totally disillusioned and deceived lover. She literally had forgotten the tangible and insurmountable problems which engulfed her: "elle ne se rappelait point la cause de son horrible état, c'est-à-dire la question d'argent. Elle ne souffrait que de son amour, et sentait son âme l'abandonner par ce souvenir; comme les blessés, en agonisant, sentent l'existence qui s'en va par leur plaie qui saigne" (426). The idea of taking arsenic came to her at this moment, and it seemed to be more of a solution to her romantic deceptions than to her monetary and conjugal difficulties.

The incompatibility between Emma and her world was strikingly demonstrated during her visits to Lheureux, maître Guillaumin, and Binet. These superb vignettes were more revealing of the materialism and shallowness of provincial life than of Emma's decadence or degradation. Having extracted his pound of flesh, Lheureux was completely indifferent to her plight; Guillaumin attempted to buy her, and her magnificent "Je suis à plaindre, mais pas à vendre" (413) epitomized Emma's idealism and panache. The scene with Binet was reported by mesdames Tuvache and Caron. In a manner reminiscent of a Greek Chorus, they gave their impression of what was transpiring and interspersed their reportage with moral comments. This short section, a superb literary effort, was Flaubert's commentary on the pettiness of the women more than a condemnation of Emma.

The death scene, worthy of a master painter's palette, still depicted an uncompromising Emma, even though she realized for the first time the full extent of Charles's love. The very act of communion was a reassertion of Emma, who appeared transported by joy, "sans doute retrouvant au milieu d'un apaisement extraordinaire la volupté perdue de ses premiers élancements mystiques, avec des visions de béatitude éternelle qui commençaient" (440–441). When the priest presented the crucifix to her, "elle allongea le cou comme quelqu'un qui a soif, et, collant des lèvres sur le corps de l'Homme-Dieu, elle y déposa de toute sa force expirante le plus grand baiser d'amour qu'elle eût jamais donné" (441). Having failed to find her happiness with mortal man, she had turned for the second and final time with the same fervor and passion to Man-God, this time with every hope that her dreams, illusions, and concept of beauty and happiness would not be betrayed. This assurance was shattered by the reappearance of l'Aveugle. His song evoked a "rire atroce, frénétique, désespéré" that suggested both a bitter realization of the futility of having pursued dreams and illusions on earth, and the more frightening thought that nothing more promising awaited her after death. That hideous possibility induced the final convulsion that racked her body: "elle n'existait plus" (443).

Society had exacted its vengeance upon a woman who had consistently refused in any meaningful way to fulfill the duties and responsibilities she had voluntarily assumed upon becoming "madame." For Flaubert, who complained to Louise Colet that he still carried "comme un galérien la marque dans le cou" of his "époque sentimentale" (II, 114), Emma's destruction must have represented the height of irony. Surely, no one was in a better position to appreciate Emma's anguish and torment at being chained to a society in which acceptance could be obtained only by renouncing those very qualities which distinguished the sensitive soul from the poor wretches who constituted the bourgeois world—those characters so antipathetic that Flaubert found it almost impossible to "enter their skins."

As a recent critic pointed out, "*Madame Bovary*! the appellative warns us that our heroine is married, and to a bourgeois—a premise not for romance, but for complications, if she happens to be romance-minded."[9] Too many critics, unfortunately, have over-emphasized the sex and money factors. We agree with Alison Fairlie, an eminent Flaubert specialist, that money was actually "the most minor of matters"[10] in Emma's mind, though, to be sure, it was this insouciant attitude toward money that helped create her insoluble problem. As for sex, for Emma it was more a mental obsession than a physical passion, the latter serving primarily to reinforce the former, and this malady permeated every fiber of her being. Her despair was augmented by another important failing, an absence of "indestructible inner resources" which could have sustained her when the actions of others disappointed or betrayed her (see Fairlie, p. 42).

In writing this penitential novel, Flaubert, for whom "l'ironie pourtant semble dominer la vie" (II, 139), had deliberately set out at the suggestion of his friends Louis Bouilhet and Maxime du Camp to purge himself of the very virus that infected Emma, that is, an incurable reliance and insistence upon dream-wishes and illusions. By using *Madame Bovary* instead of *Emma Bovary* as the title, he more ironically and effectively indicated the smugness and shallowness of bourgeois society not only for its destruction of persons who, like Emma, dared to live their dreams, but also for the varying degrees of frustration and unhappiness it imposed upon the unnumerable dreamers not bold enough to rebel as Emma did. It was in this sense, we feel, that Flaubert made his famous statement: "Ma Bovary pleure dans tous les villages de France." Had he chosen *Emma Bovary*, the full impact of his ironic indictment would have been vitiated, for Emma's actions from the outset would have been justified by her romantic antecedents, since the title would then have implied a more logical and identifiable continuation of the pre-Madame Emma.

NOTES

1. Jean Pommier, "Noms et prénoms dans 'Madame Bovary,'" *Mercure de France* (June 1949), pp. 244–264.

2. Alfred G. Engstrom, "Flaubert's Correspondence and Symbolic Structure of *Madame Bovary*," *Studies in Philology*, v. 46 (1949), 480.

3. Gustave Flaubert, *Oeuvres complètes*, Société Française d'Editions d'Art (Paris, 1902), I, p. 80. Further references to Flaubert's *Oeuvres* will be included in the text and indicated only by page number.

4. Charles Baudelaire, "Madame Bovary," *L'Artiste* (Oct. 18, 1857), tr. by Raymond Giraud, reprinted in *Flaubert: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), p. 92.

5. Gustave Flaubert, *Correspondence* (Paris: Louis Conard, 1910), II, p. 238. Other references to this three-volume edition of Flaubert's correspondence will be included in the text and indicated by volume and page. It is significant that in his numerous letters to Louise Colet between 1851 and 1855 Flaubert never referred to the novel he was writing as *Madame Bovary* but always as "la Bovary" or "ma Bovary."

6. Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis* (New York: Doubleday, 1957), p. 431.

7. Harry Levin, *The Gates of Horn* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 256.

8. Lucien Laumet, *La Sensibilité de Flaubert,* ed. by Poulet-Malassis (Paris: Alençon, 1951), p. 222.

9. Benjamin F. Bart, *Madame Bovary and the Critics* (New York: New York University Press, 1966), p. 109.

10. Alison Fairlie, *Flaubert: Madame Bovary* (London: Edward Arnold, 1962), p. 54.